

Doch. 95-42

ORIGINAL

Heron, Burchette, Ruckert & Rothwell

Austin, Texas
Sacramento, California
Phoenix, Arizona
Mesa, Arizona
Omaha, Nebraska

Suite 700
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
P.O. Box 96670
Washington, D.C. 20090

Lincoln, Nebraska
Rapid City, South Dakota
Denver, Colorado
Colorado Springs, Colorado
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

(202) 337-7700
TWX 710-822-9270
FAX (202) 898-7723

September 22, 1989

Direct Dial Number:
(202) 898-2603

RECEIVED

SEP 22 1989

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

By: Hand Delivery

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ms. Donna R. Searcy
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Request of A.C. Nielsen for
Permissive Authority to Use
Line 22;
FCC Public Notice DA 89-1060.

Dear Ms. Searcy:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of A.C. Nielsen Company
("Nielsen") in the above-referenced proceeding are an original
and four copies of Nielsen's "Comments."

Any questions regarding this matter may be referred to the
undersigned.

Sincerely,


Grier C. Raclin

cc: John C. Johnson, Jr., Esq.
Bruce H. Turnbull, Esq.

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

SEP 22 1989

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

In the Matter of:)
)
Request Of A.C. Nielsen Co.) DA 89-1060
for Permissive Use of Line)
22 of the Active Portion of)
the Television Video Signal)

To: The Commission

COMMENTS OF
A.C. NIELSEN COMPANY

Respectfully submitted,

A.C. NIELSEN COMPANY

Grier C. Raclin, Esq.

Heron, Burchette, Ruckert &
Rothwell
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 337-7700

Dated: September 22, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY.....	i
I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	1
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND.....	4
III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	6
IV. THE NEED FOR AUTHORITY TO USE LINE 22.....	9
V. NIELSEN'S USE OF LINE 22 WILL NOT DEGRADE OR INTERFERE WITH BROADCAST RECEPTION.....	12
VI. AMOL'S "COMPATIBILITY" WITH OTHER LINE 22 TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS.....	14

SUMMARY

Nielsen's Request for Permissive Authority to use line 22 of the active video signal conforms in all respects with prior granted requests for similar authority, and should therefore be granted without further delay. Nielsen proposes to use line 22 to transmit "Signal Identification" Codes in support of its national ratings business and to provide to independent program syndicators with verification of the broadcast of commercial advertisements. Both of these services have already been found by the Commission to be "broadcast related" and to serve the public interest. In addition, the Commission has determined that the transmission of Nielsen's Codes on line 22 will not interfere or degrade television service. Because Nielsen's use of line 22 thus conforms with the Commission's announced requirements, there simply is no reason to deny Nielsen's Request.

Nielsen's SID Codes may be transmitted on line 22 without inhibiting in any way others' authorized use of line 22. In any case, once the Commission has insured that broadcast service will not be degraded by the granting of Nielsen's Request, it should continue to leave to the marketplace the determination of whether differing transmission systems should be made "compatible" and the manner in which that "compatibility" should be achieved.

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

SEP 22 1989

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

In the Matter of:)
)
Request Of A.C. Nielsen Co.) DA 89-1060
for Permissive Use of Line)
22 of the Active Portion of)
the Television Video Signal)

To: The Commission

COMMENTS OF
A.C. NIELSEN COMPANY

A.C. Nielsen Company ("Nielsen"), by its attorneys, hereby provides its "Comments" on the issues raised in the Commission's Public Notice, DA 89-1060, released September 1, 1989 (the "Public Notice"):

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. This proceeding was initiated by the filing by Nielsen on July 19 1989 of a Request for Permissive Authority (the "Request"). The Request sought the grant by the Commission of authority that would allow broadcast licensees to use "Line 22" of the "active video signal" to transmit "Source Identification"

(or "SID") Codes.^{1/} These Codes would be transmitted in support of Nielsen's national ratings service and other similar broadcast related services that Nielsen might provide to its clients, such as commercial advertisement audience estimates. On August 18, 1989, Nielsen's Request was opposed by "Airtrax," a California partnership that already had received authority to use line 22, which it intends to use in support of its own proposed program and advertisement verification services. Nielsen responded to Airtrax's Opposition on August 21, 1989. On September 1, 1989, the Commission issued the above-referenced Public Notice, in which it requested public comment on Nielsen's Request.^{2/2}

2. In addition, to overcome the unanticipated delay Nielsen has incurred in obtaining its requested permissive authority,^{3/} and in conformance with the procedures followed by the Commission

^{1/} "Source Identification" (or "SID") codes identify a program's originating source, and city, date and time of origination. By letter to Bradley Holmes, Esq., dated August 11, 1989, Nielsen responded to the Commission's July 28, 1989 request for a description of the technical characteristics of the transmission system proposed by Nielsen to be used to transmit Nielsen's SID Codes.

^{2/}Contrary to statements made in the Public Notice, supra at 2, it does not appear that "the Commission has always requested public comment on systems proposing to use line 22." Public Notice at 2. Indeed, the grants of authority to use line 22 issued to Vidcode, Inc., Republic, Inc. and Airtrax all appear to have been issued without the application of public notice procedures.

^{3/}Compare, for example, the fact that Airtrax received its authority to use line 22 only six days after filing its complete request for that authority.

when it granted broadcast licensees authority to use Nielsen's encoding system to encode and then transmit SID Codes on line 20,^{4/} Nielsen filed on August 14, 1989 a request for Special Temporary Authority ("STA") to allow the transmission of Nielsen's SID Codes on line 22 for a limited period of time and in order to test the operation of Nielsen line 22 transmission system. The request for temporary authority was opposed by Airtrax in letter form on August 25, 1989, and was belatedly opposed on September 13, 1989 by "VidCode Incorporated" ("VidCode"), another company that had previously received authority to use line 22 for the purpose of transmitting SID Codes in connection with an advertising verification service it proposes to offer. Nielsen's STA request is still pending with the Commission.^{5/}

^{4/}See Amendment of Section 73.682 of the Commission's Rules to Permit the Transmission of Program Related Signals, 46 Fed. Reg. 40024 (July 29, 1981); 47 C.F.R. § 73.682(a)(21) (1989); and Permitting Transmission of Program-Related Signals in the Vertical Blanking Interval of the Standard Television Signal, 43 Fed. Reg. 49331 (Sept. 2, 1978)

^{5/}Although the Commission has tentatively determined that the transmission of Nielsen's SID Codes on line 22 would not interfere with or degrade television service received by viewers, Public Notice at 1 and see text infra, it, at the same time, requested "additional verification" that transmission of the Codes will not "degrade the visible television picture." Id. at 2. Nielsen respectfully submits that the information it has already provided to the Commission more than adequately establishes that the transmission of Nielsen's SID Codes on line 22 will not degrade television service in any way. It must be noted in this regard, moreover, that the Commission's refusal to grant Nielsen's STA Request before comments in response to the Public Notice were required to be filed has prohibited Nielsen from providing further evidence on this point.

II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

3. The Commission has determined that ratings services and program broadcast verifications are "important . . . to many entities involved in producing the programs which [a] station broadcasts, and without which its viable operation . . . would be impossible." Coded Information in TV Broadcasts, 18 R.R.2d 1776, 1787 (1970). The Commission similarly has noted that SID Code transmissions in support of either programs or commercial verification services, "while not intended for use by the viewing public . . . clearly are related to . . . the operation of television station's primary program service," Letter dated July 18, 1985 from James C. McKinney to Burton Greenberg, President of Telescan, Inc. (the "Telescan Authorization"), and has recognized that the transmission of those Codes contribute to efficient broadcast operations, Letter dated July 18, 1985 from James C. McKinney to Erwin G. Krasnow, Counsel to Ad Audit, Inc. (the "Ad Audit Authorization"). Consequently, the Commission has repeatedly determined that SID Code transmissions were "special signals," the broadcast of which was in the public interest, and thus has consistently granted requests to use line 22 that were effectively identical to Nielsen's. Telescan Authorization, supra; Ad Audit Authorization, supra; Letter dated October 26, 1988 from Alex R. Felker to Kevin McMahon, Counsel to VidCode, Inc. (the "VidCode Authorization"); Letter dated November 6, 1986 from James C. McKinney to John G. Johnson, Jr., Counsel to

Republic Properties, Inc. (the "Republic Authorization"), and see letter dated August 28, 1987 from William H. Johnson to Schuyler M. Moore, Esq., Counsel to Republic Properties, Inc. (the "Airtrax Authorization").

4. The Commission has determined with specific regard to **Nielsen's** SID Code transmission system that "the transmission on broadcast frequencies of signals intended to be used in the rendition of a nonbroadcast automatic program identification service [is] in the public interest." Permitting Transmission of Program-Related Signals, supra, quoting Report and Order in Docket 19314, 43 F.C.C.2d 927, 944 (1973) at para. 72; and see Coded Information in TV Broadcasts, supra. Furthermore, in the Public Notice initiating this proceeding, the Commission tentatively concluded that, based upon the evidence presented to date by Nielsen:

(1) the Nielsen [line 22 transmission] system should qualify as a "special signal;" (2) its use will enhance broadcast operation; (3) that [transmission] system is compatible with technical standards for television service and will not produce unacceptable interference with, or degradation of, television service received by viewers.... For these reasons, the Commission believes that it should grant approval for television licensees to use line 22 to transmit Nielsen's [SID Codes].

Public Notice, DA 89-1060 at 1.^{6/}

^{6/}Given the Commission's tentative decision on these issues, Nielsen will not readdress these conclusions at this time but will address any challenges to these conclusions in its Reply Comments.

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5. As the Commission is aware, Nielsen provides a variety of "rating" services to members of the broadcast industry, including broadcast stations themselves, the national broadcast and cable networks, program producers (whether networks or program syndicators), and advertisers and their agencies. The most commonly known of these rating services is the "national" ratings, whereby Nielsen estimates the size and demographic composition of the national audience viewing specific nationally-televised programs.

6. Nielsen's national ratings of network and syndicated programming are compiled from two principal sources of information: (1) data regarding the stations to which monitored television receivers are tuned at specified times ("tuning" information) and regarding the demographic characteristics of the persons watching the television receivers at that time ("viewing" information), both of which are derived principally from Nielsen's "People Meters" that are located in monitored homes; and (2) data regarding the programs being broadcast by the respective broadcast stations at those times (the station's program "line up").^{7/} While its agreements with program

^{7/} In contrast, Nielsen's "local" ratings are based primarily on tuning and viewing information provided by "Audimeters" and diaries maintained on a per-household basis.

producers allow Nielsen to gather "line-up" data by any reasonably-available means, Nielsen's customers have requested, for the reasons stated below, that Nielsen use its "Automated Measurement of Line Ups" of "AMOL" system for this purpose.^{8/}

7. Through the use of the AMOL system as currently implemented in over 200 markets, SID Codes are encoded onto line 20 of nationally-televised network or syndicated programming. This encoding is done either by the program producer itself, or by the "post-production house" or distributor employed by the program producer. The encoded programs are then delivered to the respective television stations for broadcast in the normal course. When the encoded programs are broadcast by the respective stations, the Codes are detected by special AMOL receivers located by Nielsen either in the respective stations (the "in-station" method of monitoring) or in the community served by the station (the "radiated" method of monitoring)^{9/} To prepare a ratings estimate for the encoded program, the Code

^{8/} Virtually all of its network programming, and about one-half of syndicated programming, is encoded with AMOL/SID Codes at the present time. The reasons that a greater percentage of syndicated programming is not now encoded are set forth at Paragraphs 10 and 11, infra, and underlie Nielsen's Request for Permissive Authority.

^{9/} The "in-station" method of gathering line-up information is used in connection with those stations that have decided not to broadcast Nielsen's SID codes. Through the "in-station" method, the Codes are read by Nielsen's decoders located in the stations just prior to their being "stripped" by the station in the course of broadcasting the associated program or commercial.

transmission information is coupled with program-name information (the program "listings") provided by the program suppliers (thus allowing Nielsen to associate a program's name with its recorded broadcast time), and with the "tuning and viewing" information recorded by the People Meters.

8. The syndicated program industry also desires to use the AMOL system to encode commercial advertisements, and thus to verify the broadcast of those advertisements.^{10/} As the Commission is aware, program syndicators are compensated by advertisers in part on the basis of the audience estimated to be viewing commercial advertisements that are incorporated in syndicated programs. To insure that the commercials provided by the advertisers are, in fact, broadcast at their anticipated time and with the programs in which they are intended to be incorporated, syndicators desire to encode the commercials contained in the programs with AMOL Codes along with the programs themselves. When these commercials are then broadcast by the respective stations, Nielsen will decode and "read" the codes in the local markets just as it does in preparing its program ratings, and will thereby verify the transmission of the

^{10/}At least one network presently uses AMOL-generated data to verify the broadcast of commercial announcements

advertisements and produce audience estimates for the commercials.^{11/}

9. In short, without the use of AMOL to obtain highly reliable program line-up information and verify the broadcast of commercial advertisements, Nielsen would not be able to prepare or provide its national ratings and commercial verification data with the accuracy and timeliness required by the broadcast industry.

IV. THE NEED FOR AUTHORITY TO USE LINE 22.

10. As the Commission is aware, syndicated programs are often broadcast by the respective stations at times that vary from station-to-station, and at times different from when the programs are delivered (usually by satellite) to the respective stations. To delay the broadcast in this manner, the stations record these programs for broadcast at a later time. Due to the technical characteristics of the recording, editing and playback

^{11/}Advertisements are often dis-associated from programs in barter syndication arrangements because the programs are not broadcast as scheduled, and yet the syndicator's compensation may often be tied to the broadcast of the advertisement at the scheduled, regardless of whether the advertisement was contained within its intended program. To track the broadcast of advertisements that become disassociated in this manner, Nielsen now produces a "With Spot" report that is based upon the scheduled (versus actual) broadcast of the relevant advertisements. To verify that these broadcasts have actually occurred, and thus greatly increase the reliability and timeliness of Nielsen's "With Spot" Reports, syndicators and advertisers alike desire the AMOL system to be available to verify the transmission of syndicated barter advertisements.

equipment used by many stations, however, the Nielsen SID Codes that are now placed on line 20 (but not those placed on line 22) are often "stripped" or deleted during playback or editing of the programs because that equipment is designed to "pass" (or not strip) only the active portion of the video picture.^{12/} This stripping obviously renders the AMOL system of limited use to obtain program line-up or commercial verification information related to recorded -- i.e., syndicated -- programming.^{13/}

11. The inability to rely upon AMOL-generated line-up data in connection with syndicated programming not only inhibits Nielsen's ability to generate highly reliable barter commercial transmission verifications, it also results in ratings of syndicated programs that are less reliable and far more time-consuming to produce than ratings and commercial verifications that would be derived from AMOL-produced line-up and verification data.

^{12/} This stripping is not limited to "misaligned" or otherwise defective or inadequate equipment, as Airtrax has suggested. Airtrax Opposition at 8. Rather, this stripping occurs because most of the recording and editing equipment used today is designed to pass or record only the "active" portion of the video signal; i.e., line 22 and above. During meetings with Nielsen and the FCC staff, Airtrax itself acknowledged that this stripping likewise would limit its own use of line 20.

^{13/} While it sometimes occurs, this "stripping" problem is less significant with regard to network programming principally because network programming normally is broadcast by the network affiliates (with the SID Codes) at the time it is received at the stations, thus not requiring the use of recording and editing equipment that strips the Codes during editing or playback.

12. Specifically, Nielsen's ratings of syndicated programs that are not encoded with AMOL codes rely upon line-up information provided by the program syndicators. These line-ups are, in turn, based upon broadcast schedules obtained from the respective broadcast stations.^{14/} This information is inherently unreliable relative to the electronically-generated AMOL data because it reflects only the times that specified programs or commercials were scheduled to be broadcast, not the times when those programs or commercials actually were broadcast. In addition, due to conflicts that normally appear in the data (such as when two programs are "scheduled" by different producers to be broadcast by the same station at the same time), Nielsen and its syndication clients are required to undertake an expensive and time-consuming effort to resolve "conflicts" appearing in manually-produced line-up information.^{15/} Use of AMOL-generated data would provide a manner of instantly resolving these conflicts, thus greatly increasing the reliability of the resulting ratings and decreasing substantially the time, effort and cost that syndicators must now invest in conflict resolution. For these reasons, Nielsen's syndicator clients have requested that Nielsen pursue the necessary authority required to allow the

^{14/} It would be virtually impossible for Nielsen itself to contact each and every station nationwide to obtain actually telecast line ups.

^{15/} During the beginning of the current fall season, for example, Nielsen must resolve up to 20,000 conflicts per week!

use of the AMOL system in connection with the preparation of syndicated program ratings and to verify the broadcast of commercial advertisements.

V. NIELSEN'S USE OF LINE 22 WILL NOT DEGRADE OR INTERFERE WITH BROADCAST RECEPTION

13. The technical characteristics and specifications of Nielsen's AMOL system have been provided to, and reviewed and approved by, the Commission. The AMOL system was first described and approved for use by the Commission in 1974, when the National Broadcasting Company ("NBC") and the other major television networks obtained Special Temporary Authority ("STA") to test the AMOL system by using it to broadcast SID Codes on line 20 of the Vertical Blanking Interval. See Comments of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., filed on February 1, 1979 in B.C. Doc. No. 78-308, at 3. Based upon these test results, the Commission determined that the AMOL system would not cause degradation of television service. Specifically, the Commission determined that the AMOL system data revealed

virtually no potential for program degradation . . . and the testing done pursuant to the STA's seems to confirm this. Therefore, we would anticipate no problems in allowing the SID signals to be transmitted on the same non-interfering basis as currently applies for other test signals and cue and control signals.

Permitting Transmission of Program-Related Signals in the Vertical Blanking Interval of the Standard Television Signal, 43

Fed. Reg. 49331, 49333 (Sept. 22, 1978), at Para 6.^{16/} Consistent use of the AMOL system in over 200 markets during the 15 years since the granting of NBC's STA has fully confirmed this conclusion; use of the AMOL system on line 20 has not degraded received television service in any way.

14. Nielsen's proposed use of the AMOL system to encode SID Codes onto line 22 similarly will not interfere or degrade television broadcast service. The technical characteristics of the AMOL system that will be used to transmit SID Codes on line 22 are exactly the same as those that the Commission reviewed and approved with regard to the use of line 20, the only difference being the minor modification to the AMOL encoders (a change of a "E-PROM" chip) required to allow it to encode on line 22.^{17/}

15. Similarly, for the same reasons that were found to be sufficient when authority to use line 22 was granted to Telescan,

^{16/} In 1981, based upon the successful completion of the tests authorized in the NBC STA and a Petition filed by NBC in 1977, the FCC amended its Rules to allow the AMOL system to be used to broadcast the SID codes on line 20. Amendment of Section 73.682 of the Commission's Rules to Permit the Transmission of Program Related Signals, 46 Fed. Reg. 40024 (July 29, 1981); 47 C.F.R. § 73.682(a)(21) (1989).

^{17/} Notwithstanding the fact that the technical characteristics of Nielsen's AMOL System as used on line 22 are the same as the characteristics of the system as used on line 20 (which have already been provided to the Commission), we have set forth the technical characteristics of the Nielsen AMOL/line 22 system in Exhibit B hereto.

Ad Audit, VidCode, Republic and Airtrax (i.e., over-scanning by television receivers), Nielsen's AMOL/SID Codes transmitted on line 22 will not be visible to viewers. To confirm that the Codes would not be visible, Nielsen on May 30 - June 2, 1989 undertook viewing tests during which individuals were given videotapes that were encoded with SID Codes on line 22 for viewing on their home television sets during a four-day period. Not a single viewer in the test reported seeing the Codes, even though some were told in advance that the Codes were present. Moreover, to allow the Commission itself to verify that the SID Codes appearing on line 22 would not be visible to the television audience, Nielsen provided to the Commission's staff a VHS format videotape of a typical television program, line 22 of which was encoded with AMOL/SID Codes. As is readily apparent from a viewing of that tape, Nielsen's SID Codes are not visible during normal television viewing and the presence of the Codes on line 22 does not degrade the perceived quality of the program in any way. Based upon this evidence, the FCC in its Public Notice specifically (albeit tentatively) determined that the AMOL/SID Code transmissions on line 22 would be "compatible with technical standards for television service and will not produce unacceptable interference with, or degradation of, television service received by viewers." Public Notice, supra at 2.

**VI. AMOL'S "COMPATIBILITY" WITH OTHER LINE 22 TRANSMISSION
SYSTEMS**

16. The Commission's Public Notice requested comments on the ways in which Nielsen's AMOL system might be made "compatible" with other transmission system proposing to use line 22. By "compatible," Nielsen assumes that the Commission is requesting comments upon whether steps can be taken to allow more than one transmission service to use line 22 in a manner adequate to satisfy their separate business interests.

17. Various technical ways in which to render transmission systems "compatible" might be worthy of the significant technical investigation that would be required to address this issue. However, Nielsen must respectfully suggest, and the Commission has repeatedly determined, that the marketplace, not the Commission itself, would be the best decider of which, if any, service should be offered through use of line 22, and which, if any, transmission system or systems should be used to offer those services. If line 22 services that the marketplace desires cannot be offered in the manner desired by the market because the transmission systems used to provide various services are "incompatible," the marketplace will require that the systems be made reasonably compatible or that the respective service providers find some other resolution to the "incompatibility." The Commission's attempts to allocate the use of line 22 among

competing users as a part of this proceeding, on the other hand, would greatly and unfairly inhibit Nielsen's ability to prepare reliable ratings of syndicated programming and verify the broadcast of commercial advertisements, and also would subvert the efficient operation of the market. In addition, it would, at best, provide only an interim solution because constant modifications to the "compatibility" specifications would have to be adopted as new services and transmission systems are proposed for line 22.

18. The Commission traditionally has relied upon the marketplace to arrive at the appropriate means to satisfy consumers' needs and demands, and to fulfill the Commission's goals. This reliance on the marketplace, which the Commission specifically has placed in connection with proposed uses of the spectrum,^{18/} will more surely secure efficient use of line 22 than the Commission's allocation of the right to use this resource. The marketplace approach has consistently proven to be the most flexible and effective mechanism to achieve the Commission's objectives of promoting efficient use of the spectrum and stimulating technological innovation, without imposing unduly

^{18/}See, e.g., Amendment of Parts 2, 73 and 76 of the Commission's Rules to Authorize the Offering of Data Transmission Services on the Vertical Blanking Interval by TV Stations, 57 R.R.2d 832, 834-5 (1985); Domestic Fixed Transponder Sales, 90 F.C.C.2d 1238, 1249 (1982); Revisions to Part 21 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Multipoint Distribution Service, 2 FCC Rcd. 4251, 4252 (1987)

restrictive regulation on new and evolving communications services. A marketplace approach to the uses to be made of Line 22 would also be consistent with the well-known economic theorem that the government is better served by setting forth the goals to be achieved but leaving the means to achieve those goals to those obligated by the market to do so. See Amendment of Parts 2 and 22 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Liberalization of Technology and Auxiliary Service Offerings in the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service, 3 FCC Rcd. 7033, 7041 (1988) (individual cellular operators are best able to determine the most efficient manner to offer auxiliary services while meeting certain objectives).

19. The Commission has, in fact, traditionally followed the marketplace approach to proposed uses to line 22. Specifically, while the Commission has specified that use of the line should not interfere with or degrade broadcast service received by viewers, it has left to the marketplace the decision of which service provider should actually provide service. The Commission should continue to follow this approach by establishing the overriding objectives it seeks to achieve in connection with the use of Line 22, but leave the decision regarding the appropriate means to accomplish those objectives to those charged by the marketplace to do so.

20. One manner of continuing this practice in light of increasing demands for the right to use line 22 might be to implement a proposal Nielsen understands to have been made by the Commission's staff. Specifically, it has been suggested that users of line 22 use equipment that would automatically pause the encoding process when other codes are sensed, and would begin the encoding process again after the other codes have ceased.^{19/} Use of this procedure would assure that the technical operation of the broadcast system is not adversely affected, but would leave it to the marketplace to determine how best to allocate the use of line 22 because all service demanded by the market would, by definition, be protected from having their codes deleted by other users.

21. In closing, Nielsen must stress that it is imperative that the Commission undertake its most expeditious review and

^{19/} For example, were Airtrax to encode a commercial advertisement that was incorporated into a syndicated television program that, in turn, was to be encoded with Nielsen's AMOL/SID Codes, both codes could be incorporated into the final product -- the AMOL code on the program and the Airtrax codes on the commercial incorporated into the programs -- simply by using available technology that would "shut off" the second encoder whenever it sensed the presence of the other codes. The availability of this technology reveals that, contrary to Airtrax's unwarranted protestations, a granting of Nielsen's Request would not inhibit or prohibit in any way the providing of advertising verification services in general, or Airtrax's proposed service in particular. In any case, other advertising verification service providers -- e.g., Advertising Verification, Inc. -- offer those services other than using line 22.

grant of Nielsen's Request. The 1989 Fall television season has already begun and, because of the delay already incurred by Nielsen in having its Request reviewed by the Commission, syndicated program providers -- and the industry as a whole -- have been unable to receive ratings that are as reliable as they deserve and require to operate their businesses efficiently, and Nielsen has been inhibited from providing advertisement verifications and audience measurements to the syndicated program industry. Further delays should not be imposed by the industry.

22. All Nielsen is seeking through its Request is the opportunity to participate in that market under the same terms and conditions that have been applied to Airtrax and other authorized users of line 22. For these and other reasons, Nielsen strongly urges that the Commission grant Nielsen's Request for access to the same resources to which others have been granted access, and leave to the marketplace the resolution

of the manner in which alternative codes can be made
"compatible."

Respectfully submitted,

A.C. NIELSEN COMPANY

By: 
Grier C. Raclin

Heron, Burchette, Ruckert &
Rothwell
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 337-7700

Dated: September 22, 1989

A